



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,987	10/30/2003	Henry Milan	16597	7868
4859	7590	07/14/2004	EXAMINER	
MACMILLAN SOBANSKI & TODD, LLC ONE MARITIME PLAZA FOURTH FLOOR 720 WATER STREET TOLEDO, OH 43604-1619			GUSHI, ROSS N	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2833	

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/696,987	MILAN, HENRY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ross N. Gushi	2833	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4,6-13 and 15-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 5,14 and 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 April 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/14/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Selker.

Regarding claims 1, Anderson discloses an electronic housing device comprising a housing 108 for enclosing electronics and having an opening 118 formed therein; a first electrical connector 114 supported on said housing and being accessible; an extendable housing portion 116 mounted in said opening and being selectively moveable into and out of said housing; and a second electrical connector 114' mounted on said extendable housing portion, said second electrical connector being accessible when said extendable housing portion is extended out of said housing and not being accessible when said extendable housing portion is retracted into said housing (see figures 3 and 4).

Anderson does not show the line cord. Selker discloses a device including the line cord 26. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to include a line cord on the Anderson device as taught in Selker. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to supply power to the device as taught in Selker.

Per claim 10 Anderson discloses at least one hinge connecting said extendable housing portion to said housing for swinging said extensible housing portion into and out of said opening.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, and 19, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crane et al. ("Crane") in view of Strazzabosco.

Regarding claim 1, Crane discloses an electronic housing device comprising: a housing for enclosing electronics, a line cord 20 attached at one end to said housing and having an opposite end adapted to be connected to a source of electrical power; a first electrical connector 42 supported on said housing and being accessible.

Crane does not disclose an extendable housing. Strazzabosco discloses an extendable housing portion 44 mounted in an opening and being selectively moveable into and out of a housing (12, 13) and a second electrical connector mounted on said extendable housing portion, said second electrical connector being accessible when said extendable housing portion is extended out of said housing and not being accessible when said extendable housing portion is retracted into said housing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to replace the Crane sockets 66 with retractable sockets as taught in Strazzabosco. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to provide an outlet strip which was adjustable to accommodate a larger or lesser number of plugs as taught in Strazzabosco (col. 1, line 10).

Regarding claims 2, 3, and 4, Strazzabosco discloses two prong sockets and Crane discloses standard three prong sockets. At the time of the invention, it would

have been obvious to make the retractable outlets (as taught by Strazzabosco) standard three prong outlets (hot, neutral, ground) as taught in Crane. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been safety, as is well known in the art.

Per claim 6, Strazzabosco discloses stops 34.

Per claim 8, said first electrical connector is mounted on an exposed end of said extensible housing portion.

Per claim 9, said Crane line cord, said first electrical connector and said second electrical connector are connected to a surge protection device.

Claims 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, and 19 are rejected for the reasons pertaining to claims 1-4, 6, 8, and 9.

Claims 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crane in view of Strazzabosco as in claims 1 and 11 in view of Sharples. Strazzabosco does not disclose springs. Sharples discloses a spring mechanism 96 to urge an extendable housing outward. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to include a spring mechanism to urge the extendable housing out, as taught in Sharples. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to assist in moving the socket outward as taught in Sharples.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5, 14, and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art does not suggest

Art Unit: 2833

the devices as claimed, including the combination of all the claimed elements, the combination including the complimentary guide rails as claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ross Gushi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2005. If attempts to reach the examiner by phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley, can be reached at 571-272-2800 extension 33. The phone number for the Group's facsimile is (703) 872-9306.

ROSS GUSHI
PRIMARY EXAMINE

